



Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal
New South Wales

Application for assessment of a local infrastructure contributions plan – Part A

Campbelltown City Council

Menangle Park Contributions Plan

Application
Local Government

Version 5 April 2018



Contents

1	Instructions	1
1.1	Who should fill in this application form?	1
1.2	How should a council submit an application?	1
2	Preliminary Information	2
2.1	All applications	2
2.2	For contributions plans previously reviewed by IPART	4
3	Assessment Criteria	5
3.1	Criterion 1 – the Essential Works List	5
3.2	Criterion 2 – Nexus	7
3.3	Criterion 3 – Reasonable costs	11
3.4	Criterion 4 – Reasonable timeframe	14
3.5	Criterion 5 – Reasonable apportionment	15
3.6	Criterion 6 – Appropriate community liaison	19
3.7	Criterion 7 – The plan complies with other matters IPART considers relevant	21
4	Quality assurance	22
5	Attachment checklist	23

1 Instructions

1.1 Who should fill in this application form?

This form is for NSW councils that are submitting a **local infrastructure contributions plan** to IPART for assessment. A separate application must be submitted for each contributions plan.

Councils are encouraged to discuss information requirements or other queries relating to the contributions plan assessment process with IPART prior to submitting an application.

Call IPART on 02 9290 8400 to speak to the Local Government Contributions Plan Team.

1.2 How should a council submit an application?

Councils should complete this Application Form Part A and submit it to IPART, along with the contributions plan and all relevant supporting documentation (see Checklist in section 5) by email, post or in person. We require an electronic copy of all documents.

Email	Post	In Person
Attention: Local Government Contributions Plan Team	Attention: Local Government Contributions Plan Team	Attention: Local Government Contributions Plan Team
localgovernment@nsw.gov.au	Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal PO Box K35 Haymarket Post Shop Sydney NSW 1240	Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal Level 15 2-24 Rawson Place Sydney NSW 2000

1.3 What other information is available?

Please refer to IPART's website <<https://www.ipart.nsw.gov.au/Home/Industries/Local-Government/Local-Infrastructure-Contributions-Plans>> for further information on our assessment process, including current and completed assessments. The website also has copies of:

- ▼ Application Form Part B (optional)
- ▼ *Section 94E Ministerial Direction for Local Infrastructure Contributions 2012*, as amended (Ministerial Direction), and
- ▼ *Local Infrastructure Contributions Practice Note*, January 2018.

2 Preliminary Information

2.1 All applications

A. Council information

Council name	Campbelltown City Council
Primary council contact details (Provide name, position, phone number, and email address)	Fletcher Rayner Executive Manager Urban Release & Engagement [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Secondary council contact details (Provide name, position, phone number, and email address)	Bernadette Canty Development Contributions Officer [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

B. Information about the plan

What is the name of the plan?	Menangle Park Contributions Plan												
Which clause of the <i>section 94E Ministerial Direction for Local Infrastructure Contributions</i> (Ministerial Direction) applies to this plan (ie, clause 6, 6A, 6B or 6C)?	Clause 6												
What is the current maximum contribution amount (per lot or dwelling) for this plan under the Ministerial Direction?	\$20,000												
In the absence of any cap imposed by the Ministerial Direction, what are the indicative contribution amounts (per lot or dwelling) for each type of residential development in the catchment area?	<table> <tr> <td>Town Centre Unit</td> <td>\$21,602</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Small Lot (300-419m2)</td> <td>\$30,497</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Standard Lot (420-599m2)</td> <td>\$30,497</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Standard Lot (600-949m2)</td> <td>\$44,474</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Traditional Lot (950-1999m2)</td> <td>\$44,474</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Large Lot (2000+)</td> <td>\$44,474</td> </tr> </table>	Town Centre Unit	\$21,602	Small Lot (300-419m2)	\$30,497	Standard Lot (420-599m2)	\$30,497	Standard Lot (600-949m2)	\$44,474	Traditional Lot (950-1999m2)	\$44,474	Large Lot (2000+)	\$44,474
Town Centre Unit	\$21,602												
Small Lot (300-419m2)	\$30,497												
Standard Lot (420-599m2)	\$30,497												
Standard Lot (600-949m2)	\$44,474												
Traditional Lot (950-1999m2)	\$44,474												
Large Lot (2000+)	\$44,474												

When was the plan publicly exhibited?	Public exhibition from 20 December 2017 until 29 January 2018
Has the council adopted the plan? If so, when was it adopted and when did it come into force?	The Plan was adopted 10 April 2018 and came into force 24 April 2018
To what extent was the Department of Planning & Environment (DPE) involved in the development of this plan?	Department of Planning and Environment has been involved in the process of rezoning and Precinct Planning (Master Planning).
Over what period will development in the catchment area of the plan occur?	16 Years (expected)
What proportion of the total projected development in the catchment area of the plan has been approved and/or constructed?	Nil
What planning instruments (SEPPs, LEPs, or DCPs) apply to land in the catchment area of the plan?	<p>SEPP No.21 – Caravan Parks</p> <p>SEPP No.30 – Intensive Agriculture</p> <p>SEPP No.33 – Hazardous and Offensive Development</p> <p>SEPP No.44 – Koala Habitat Protection</p> <p>SEPP No.50 – Canal Estate Development</p> <p>SEPP No.55 – Remediation of Land</p> <p>SEPP No.64 – Advertising and Signage</p> <p>SEPP No.65 – Design Quality of Residential Apartment Development</p> <p>SEPP No.70 – Affordable Housing (Revised Schemes)</p> <p>SEPP (Housing for Seniors or People with a Disability) 2004</p> <p>SEPP No.19 - Bushland in Urban Areas</p> <p>SEPP (Vegetation in Non-Rural Areas) 2017</p> <p>SEPP (Building Sustainability Index: BASIX) 2004</p> <p>SEPP (State Significant Precincts) 2005</p> <p>SEPP (Mining, Petroleum Production and Extractive Industries) 2007</p> <p>SEPP (Miscellaneous Consent Provisions) 2007</p> <p>SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007</p> <p>SEPP (Exempt and Complying Development Codes) 2008</p> <p>SEPP (Affordable Rental Housing) 2009</p> <p>SEPP (State and Regional Development) 2011</p> <p>SEPP (Educational Establishments and Child</p>

	Care Facilities) 2017 Sydney REP No.20 - Hawkesbury-Nepean River (No.2 - 1997 Campbelltown LEP 2015 Campbelltown (Sustainable City) DCP 2015
Has the Minister referred this contributions plan to IPART for review? If so, provide details.	No

2.2 For contributions plans previously reviewed by IPART

Councils only need to complete these three questions for plans that IPART has previously reviewed.

C. Information about revisions to the plan

Why is the council submitting the revised plan for IPART's review?	N/A
Briefly explain how the plan has been revised in response to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - recommendations made in IPART's assessment report on the previous version/s of the plan, and - any directions from the Minister for Planning in relation to IPART's assessment. 	
Briefly explain any other revisions to the plan such as updated costings, revised apportionment of costs, or amended delivery timeframe.	

3 Assessment Criteria

We will assess the contributions plan against the criteria listed in the *Local Infrastructure Contributions Practice Note*, issued by the Department of Planning and Environment (DPE) in January 2018 (Practice Note).

Your responses to the questions in this section will assist us in understanding how the plan, including the proposed cost of land and works, has been prepared.

- ▼ If the information in your proposed response is clearly set out in the contributions plan or a separate report or document, it is sufficient to refer to the appropriate sections/pages.
- ▼ Any referenced reports and documents will need to be attached to this application (see Checklist in Section 5).

3.1 Criterion 1 – the Essential Works List

The public amenities and public services in the plan are on the Essential Works List

We are required to assess whether the land and works in the contributions plan are on the Essential Works List (EWL). Refer to the Practice Note for the most recent version of this list, including a definition of base level embellishment of open space.

Checklist for the contributions plan

Does the contributions plan ...			Contributions plan page reference(s)
Include land or works not on the EWL	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Include costs for any land or works not on the EWL in the calculation of contribution rates	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Pgs 7, 22, 23, 26 - 30

1. If the plan includes costs for land and/or works not on the Essential Works List: list these items below, and indicate how their costs are to be met.

Community Centre (500m²) with the view to expand in the future (700m²) (Appendix F Social Sustainability Report Pg 40) when funds become available, at grade parking and an area for outdoor community activities.

Only the land component for community services is on the Essential Works List. However, we require details of the community services that are intended to be provided on this land, so we can determine what proportion of the land costs can be recovered through development contributions.

2. List the community services that will be provided on the land that is to be acquired for community services (eg, youth centre, library) and indicate the floor space area allocated to each.

The site is 13,700m² which accommodates Community Centre (500m²) with the view to expand in the future (700m² (Appendix F Social Sustainability Report Pg 40) when funds become available, at grade parking and an area for outdoor community activities. It is worth noting that only 2961m² of community land is in the Plan which includes 2,500m² for the facility and associated uses, and 461m² for half road provision.

The centre is to be used as a library link and used by a range of outreach services/community programs. These programs include activities/meetings for different groups in the community e.g. young people, older people, indigenous and multicultural. Such programs are to support community development and social cohesion. (Appendix F Social Sustainability Report)

3.2 Criterion 2 – Nexus

The proposed public amenities and public services are reasonable in terms of nexus (the connection between development and the demand created).

Nexus ensures that the land and works included in the contributions plan are required to meet the increased demand for facilities generated by the anticipated development.

Checklist for the contributions plan

Does the contributions plan ...	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Contributions plan page reference(s)
Incorporate a map showing the geographical catchment area of the contributions plan	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Page 2
Detail the types of development that will occur in the catchment area(s) of the plan, and the approximate area of each land use	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Pages 19, 24 & 28
Include information about:			
▼ the existing population in the catchment area	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Pages 18 -19
▼ the projected residential population and/or workforce	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Pages 19 - 21
Include details about how the need for land and works was determined	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Pages 21 - 27
Refer to design and construction standards used in determining the works in the plan	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Pages 7, 17, 26, 30-32 & 34

3. Explain the process used to determine the need for all land and works in the plan.

List any supporting studies relied on and explain any deviations from recommendations in those studies.

Transport land and works

Appendix C - AECOM letter of Advice on Parkway dated 22/6/16 and Transport Management and Accessibility Plan 2010 (TMAP) - AECOM Australia Pty Ltd were prepared to assess the transport impacts of Menangle Park, leading towards a package of measures that will achieve a sustainable outcome for the region. The key objectives were to define the transport impacts and opportunities from development of the release area, develop a package of measures to support development over time to feed into the Local Environment Study to be documented for the subject lands.

Since the TMAP was prepared, the lot estimate and future population of the release area has been revised. As a result, the trip estimates have been revised and are in the contributions Plan. (page 45)

This study was undertaken with regard to Interim Guidelines for Transport Management and Accessibility Plans (Department of Transport, 2002). The modelling aspects of the study have been undertaken with the aid of Campbelltown City Council's strategic traffic model.

Stormwater land and management works

Council's Flood Study and Flood Models

Local Environmental Study

Appendix E - Trunk Stormwater Management Strategy -

- Summary of Drainage Strategy Landcom November 2011
- Menangle Park WSUD Strategy AECOM June 2010
- Review of Drainage Options GHD November 2011
- Office of Environment and Heritage Letter dated 22/09/11
- NSW Office of Water letter dated 31/08/11
- Landcom letter to NSW Office of Water dated 25/08/11
- Menangle Park LES - Local Flooding and Stormwater Quantity Management (Detention)

In May 2010, Landcom and Council appointed GHD to prepare a Flooding and Stormwater Quantity Management Plan for Menangle Park. Landcom and Council reviewed the report and identified that an opportunity existed, due to the unique location of the urban release within the catchment and site characteristics, to redirect the stormwater management investment away from basin construction and into the naturalised stream stabilisation and improvements works.

As such, Landcom forwarded a preliminary alternative drainage strategy to the NSW office of Water in August 2010, identifying that only basins 7, 8 & 13 were required. In considering the alternate strategy it was identified that it would not alter the quality management aspects as presented in Menangle Park WSUD Strategy AECOM June 2010. This alternative drainage strategy now forms part of the Plan.

The flood study assumptions and outcomes by GHD are supported by Council's own flood studies, and the flood models have been endorsed by Council.

Open space land and works (embellishments)

Local Environmental Study

Appendix B - Open Space Concept Designs - JMD Design

Appendix F - Social Sustainability Report prepared by Heather Nesbitt Planning (Feb 2010)

In 2003/04 three workshops were held to identify key social sustainability objectives and issues for Menangle Park. One of these workshops included open space and recreation stake holders. At the workshop DIPNR outlined research into recreation needs in Western Sydney which has identified its extensive open space land resources but a lack of developed recreation infrastructure.

Landcom Open Space guidelines 2008 and NSW Growth Centres Commission Development Code 2006 were considered by the workshop and one of the recommendations was to provide high quality public open space area which benefit not only Menangle park but also destinations for the broader Macarthur region.

As only land for open space and base level embellishment may be funded through section 94 contribution where the \$20,000 cap is to be exceeded, the proposed informal youth recreation facilities are not included in the contributions plan.

Community services land

The requirements for open space and recreation facilities as a result of the expected development of Menangle park are documented in the Social Sustainability Report prepared by Heather Nesbitt Planning (Feb 2010) and Addendum by GHD (2016). This study was relied on to support the community services land requirement in the Plan.

In Table 5 of the report, the recommended community centre requirement was 700m² in the Plan it is initially 500m² with the hope to extend when funds become available.

4. Were any supporting studies prepared for the catchment area but not relied on? If so, explain why they were not used.

No

5. How has non-residential development been considered in determining the need for infrastructure in the plan.

Various studies were considered; the Draft Campbelltown Centres Structure Plan and South West Subregion Draft Subregional Strategy mentioned in Appendix C (TMAP). It is envisaged that development of retail/commercial land at Menangle Park will result in additional demand for transport and water cycle management facilities in the release area.

The employment lands will also result in additional demand for transport and water cycle management facilities (Menangle Park WSUD Strategy - AECOM June 2010), this additional demand will be funded with the development of the employment land and have been excluded from the contributions plan.

As workers in the employment areas are unlikely to significantly increase the demand for community facilities, open space and recreation facilities, no contributions are to be collected from employment development. (Pages 29 & 34 of the Plan)

6. In determining the need for infrastructure in the plan, what consideration was given to:

- a) the existing population in the catchment area
- b) any existing or projected population outside the catchment area
- c) the capacity of existing infrastructure in the catchment area, and/or
- d) any existing or proposed infrastructure outside the catchment area.

-
- a) The current population of Menangle Park is approximately 240. It is anticipated that the large majority of the approximately 80 dwellings will be demolished to make way for new residential dwellings and as a consequence no allowance has been made for the existing population in the catchment area.
 - b) Employees working within Menangle Park but living outside of the area were considered however the plan has not quantified this demand. (Page 26 of Contributions Plan). Currently there are no facilities to attract population outside of Menangle Park.
 - c) The Open Space facilities outside of the Menangle Park area were considered, it highlighted that services in the area for young people are already inadequate. The Social Sustainability Report and Addendum note (Appendix F) that there is limited provision of recreation infrastructure and no existing capacity to meet the needs of the incoming population.

In regards to the existing drainage system, the current residential areas are not serviced by sewer and the presence of septic systems is having some impact on water quality.

Existing infrastructure is limited in the Menangle park Area with a low frequency bus route. City Rail services to the South West terminate at Campbelltown or Macarthur Square with one diesel service running from Menangle Park to the city in the peak hour.

The Campbelltown City Council strategic traffic model provides an indication of road network performance at 2006 and reports that the roads in the vicinity of the Menangle Park site are operating within their theoretical capacity in the evening peak.

- d) Consideration was given to regional traffic infrastructure, in association with the proposed SIC, the NSW 2016-2017 budget has provided \$30 million to support regional traffic infrastructure, being stage one of the Spring Farm Parkway, which is intended to accelerate housing supply in this area.

The Social Sustainability Report provides an assessment of existing community facilities and services currently provided in Menangle Park and the wider area. It recognises that existing residents use services and facilities in Campbelltown's southern suburbs together with services in the Campbelltown CBD and the adjacent Wollondilly LGA.

3.3 Criterion 3 – Reasonable costs

The proposed development contribution is based on a reasonable estimate of the cost of the proposed public amenities and public services.

IPART must advise whether the proposed development contributions are based on a *reasonable* estimate of the cost of the proposed public amenities and public services. This includes how the base costs of land and each item of infrastructure are derived and the method used to calculate the contribution rates and escalate them over time.

Checklist for the contributions plan

Does the contributions plan ...	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Contributions plan page reference(s)
Explain how the proposed cost of works was derived (eg, quantity surveyor or other consultant advice, standard costs used by the council)	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Page 7
Explain how the proposed cost of land was derived	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Page 7
Include a schedule of the contributions rates (eg, \$/ha, \$/person, \$/dwelling)	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Page vii
Explain how the contribution rates will be adjusted for inflation/ changes in costs	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Page 11 - 13
Provide details of accounting arrangements for contribution funds (eg, is pooling of funds permitted, will internal borrowings be used to deliver infrastructure projects?)	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Page 15 - 16
If using a Net Present Value (NPV) approach, include assumptions made in the modelling of costs and revenue	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A

7. What is the base period for costs in the plan (eg, June 2017)?

The base rate for the works is based on the Quantity Surveyor costs (Appendix A - 5 Oct 2016) and the Land Valuations are per valuation report (Appendix G - 30 Sept 2016), neither were indexed in the Plan.

8. Explain the process used to estimate costs for works for each infrastructure category.

Refer to matters such as:

- Use of consultant or QS estimates
- Use of council costs
- Use of benchmark costs
- Any allowances included, such as professional fees and contingencies
- Details of any indexation of cost estimates to the base period of the plan, including the index used

Transport works

WT Partnership (Appendix A) undertook works costs for transport works. Professional fees, LSL and contingencies were included.

These costs form the base rate and have not been indexed in the Plan.

Stormwater management works

1. Water quantity – GHD Local Flooding & Stormwater Quantity Management (Detention) report assisted the preparation of the Works Cost Plan by WT Partnership.
2. Water quality – AECOM Menangle Park WSUD Strategy report assisted the preparation of the Works Cost Plan by WT Partnership.

These costs form the base rate and have not been indexed in the Plan.

Open space works (embellishments)

WT Partnership (Appendix A) undertook works costs for Open Space works. Professional fees, LSL and contingencies were included.

These costs form the base rate and have not been indexed in the Plan.

9. Explain the process used to estimate the cost of plan preparation and administration.

Contribution rates for Administration will be based on 1.5% of the total land acquisition and capital cost of the Plan which is consistent with the Department of Planning's 'Development Contributions Practice Notes (July 2005).'

The Plan Preparation (Appendix H Table E) lists the various consultants required to inform the Plan which have been at a significant cost. In accordance with Department of Planning's 'Development Contributions Practice Notes (July 2005).'

It is proposed that the contributions will be sought towards the cost of undertaking these studies. These costs are apportioned 100% to the Plan.

However it has been missed in error from the Contribution by Development Type table and needs to be inserted into the contribution rate in the Plan.

10. What, if any, land has the council already acquired to provide local infrastructure for development in the catchment area? How has the cost of this land been included in the plan?

Council on the sale of their land, south of the site, have an agreement with the new owners to dedicate the open space to Council for a nominal fee of \$1.

The value of this land is not in the Plan.

11. Explain the process used to estimate the cost of land yet to be acquired by the council.

Refer to:

- Details of any inclusions for just terms compensation
- Details of any indexation of cost estimates from the base period of the plan, including the index used

William C McManus (Valuations) Pty Ltd (Appendix G, Land Valuation Report) - 30 September 2016 were requested to provide valuation advice for different land uses proposed for acquisitions under the Plan in compliance with relevant legislation.

These costs form the base rate and have not been indexed in the Plan.

12. If contributions rates in the plan are calculated using an NPV model,

a) Does the model use real or nominal values?

If the model uses nominal values, what indexation assumptions are applied to costs and revenue?

What discount rate does the model use, and why?

N/A

13. What measures have been taken to minimise costs in the contributions plan (eg, adjustment to design or alternative engineering solutions)?

Basins have been reduced, Landcom forwarded a preliminary alternative drainage strategy to the NSW office of Water in August 2010, identifying that only basins 7, 8 & 13 were required. In considering the alternate strategy it was identified that it would not alter the quality management aspects as presented in Menangle Park WSUD Strategy AECOM June 2010.

The drainage strategy has also been designed to utilise and stabilise the natural floodway through the development to accommodate stormwater flows and minimise drainage infrastructure development costs. This approach makes full utilisation of existing onsite resources and reduces capital cost of implementing the drainage strategy by around 50%. It also has the benefits of enhancing environmental benefits and minimising ongoing operational maintenance costs.

Alternative funding has been sought for the Spring Farm Parkway, the NSW Government 2016-2017 budget has provided \$30 million to support regional traffic infrastructure, being stage one of the Spring Farm Parkway, which is intended to accelerate housing supply in this area.

It has also been highlighted that a number of the traffic improvements required to meet the resident and workforce needs will also meet regional traffic needs. It is intended that funding for the regional component of the works will be via the regional funding strategy.

The Employment land and associated drainage works have been removed from the Plan.

Council is well aware of the \$20,000 cap and several measures have been made to reduce the costs, including removing most of the half street frontage land and construction from the Plan for open space.

Council has not indexed the works and land in the Plan from the issuing of the QS report and land valuation report, in doing so keeping them at base rate.

3.4 Criterion 4 – Reasonable timeframe

The proposed public amenities and public services can be provided within a reasonable timeframe

Checklist for the contributions plan

Does the contributions plan ...			Contributions plan page reference(s)
Include details of the anticipated rate of development in the catchment area and how this was determined	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Page 23 - 24
Include a program for infrastructure delivery and explain how it relates to the anticipated timing of development	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Page 25 - 28
Include a statement regarding potential revision of the scheduled timing for infrastructure delivery	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Page 27

14. How has the council determined the timing of infrastructure provision?

Provide details of the program for delivery of infrastructure in the contributions plan and explain its underlying rationale.

A majority of the release area (70%) is under the control of a single developer. It is anticipated that a majority of the infrastructure requirements will be provided as works intended as part of a staged development program.

The delivery of infrastructure in the contributions plan is based on the anticipated lot development program.

Contributions maybe in the form of monetary contributions, works in kind, land dedications or a combination of these, so in some cases the timing of infrastructure/ land dedication is dependent on developers in the catchment area.

Development staging will be controlled by a few developers and suggest that developer provision of the works will be the most efficient outcome. The provision of water cycle management works identified in the Plan as works in kind in conjunction with the civil works undertaken as part of land subdivision is considered the most efficient approach to providing these facilities.

Community facility to be developed in year 10. (Appendix H)

3.5 Criterion 5 – Reasonable apportionment

The proposed development contribution is based on a reasonable apportionment of costs between existing and new demand, and also demand generated by different types of development.

Apportionment is about ensuring the allocation of costs equitably between all those who will benefit from the infrastructure or create the need for it. While nexus is about establishing a relationship between the development and demand for infrastructure, apportionment is about quantifying the extent of the relationship.

Checklist for the contributions plan

Does the contributions plan ...	Contributions plan page reference(s)
Include details of apportionment calculations	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Page 45, 48

15. How does the plan apportion costs?

Provide details of calculations made, and explain how the apportionment takes into consideration demand arising from (as relevant):

- new and existing development in the catchment area
- different stages of development
- different sub-catchments
- residential and non-residential development
- different residential development densities
- new and/or existing development outside the catchment area

a) Transport land and works

The Menangle Park Transport Management & Accessibility Plan (TMAP) prepared by AECOM identified that Menangle Park needed to contribute toward the Spring Farm Parkway. However, this component has been removed from the plan to minimise the quantum of the Contributions Plan. All remaining works and land items are to be fully funded (100%) by development within the Menangle Park Release Area. The existing and new transport network and strategies have been documented in the TMAP (page 41 of the Plan) it shows that the existing transport infrastructure is limited, which reflects the low number of residents that currently live in Menangle park and the rural nature of the area.

The forecast trips generated by the proposed development and the output from the traffic model recommended various measures. The need for transport facilities arises not only from residential development but also from new retail/commercial activity, as such contributions will be sought from both land use sectors. (page 42 of the Plan)

The details of the costs of the individual transport measures are included in Appendix H.

The contributions have been calculated on a trip generation basis, which is considered the most preferable approach given the range of different land uses (ie residential and retail/commercial) generating different trip generation rates and therefore different transport impacts. (page 44-45)

The estimated cost of providing each item is distributed to the different land use based on the calculations above.

Table 9 (page 47 of the Plan) shows the 'Apportionment Methodology'.

Stormwater management land and works

The drainage strategy requires a combination of detention basins, water quality treatment measures and floodway stabilisation measure to safely convey stormwater runoff through the development and discharge into the Nepean River.

Although land within and around Menangle Park Village is relatively fragmented, elsewhere the relatively unfragmented land ownership arrangement and the probability that development staging will be controlled by a few developers suggest that developer provision of the works will be the most efficient outcome. The provision of water cycle management works identified in the Plan as works in kind in conjunction with the civil works undertaken as part of land subdivision is considered the most efficient approach to providing these facilities.

The contribution calculations are determined on a per hectare of net developable land basis; the cost of providing the water management facility is allocated to the site that is the subject of the proposed development.

Expected development in Menangle Park will solely generate the demand for the water cycle management works included in the works schedule. Therefore the full cost of the works will be met by the expected development. (page 40 of the Plan)

Open space land and works (embellishments)

The requirements for open space and recreation facilities as a result of the expected development of Menangle Park are documented in the Social Sustainability Report prepared by Heather Nesbitt Planning (Feb 2010) and Addendum by GHD (2016).

The only existing major open space in Menangle Park is on the Nepean River. Services in the area for young people are inadequate; therefore there is no existing capacity to meet the needs of the incoming population.

The amount of land required for local open space and recreation facilities in Menangle Park has been determined on the basis of a needs analysis having regard to a range of standards applied to the development.

Concept designs for local parks, district parks and playing fields have been prepared and are provided in Appendix B. The designs provide for base level embellishment in accordance with the definition of 'base level embellishment' in the IPART Practice Note (1 March 2011).

All facilities will be developed in a manner that allows the facilities to serve the local needs generated by the population of the release area.

Contributions will be collected from residential development toward open space and recreation facilities under the Plan.

As workers in the employment area are unlikely to significantly increase the demand for open space and recreation facilities within the release area, no contributions can be collected from the employment development in this regard.

The contribution is calculated on the estimated cost of providing the open space and recreation facilities and distributed by the contribution catchment (persons) to each facility.

Facilities in the Plan have been sized to reflect the demand generated by the population expected of the residential development.

d) Community services land

The requirements for community facilities as a result of the expected development at Menangle Park are documented in the Social Sustainability Report prepared by Heather Nesbitt Planning (Feb 2010).

The Social Sustainability Report provides an assessment of existing community facilities and services currently provided in Menangle Park and the wider area. In general local community infrastructure is limited given the small existing population in Menangle Park and does not have the capacity to accommodate the demand generated by the proposed development. The report recommended a Community Centre and Outside School Hours Centre (in association with primary public school to be funded by the NSW Government/Special Infrastructure Contribution).

Council has made provision to acquire land sufficient to deliver 500m² facility as recommended by the GHD 2016 report, the size is not ideal but sufficient to deliver a range of community programs.

A total size of 13,700m² is proposed for the facility, at grade parking and an area for outdoor activities. It will enable the community facility to be expanded in the future when funds become available.

It is intended that the community facility will be provided in year 10 of the development.

Contributions will be collected from the residential development towards the acquisition of the land (2961m²), no contributions are sought from workers in the employment areas as they are unlikely to significantly increase the demand for community facilities.

The contribution is calculated on the estimated cost of acquiring the community land and distributing by the contribution catchment (persons).

The monetary contribution for different residential development types is determined by multiplying per person by the assumed average household occupancy rates.

Plan preparation and administration

The need for the plan and the various consultants required to inform the Plan is generated by the new development in the Menangle Park new release area. The contribution rates for the Plan Preparation and Administration are therefore calculated on the assumption that the full cost is distributed among the expected development.

Contribution rates for Administration will be based on 1.5% of the total land acquisition and capital cost of the Plan which is consistent with the Department of Planning's 'Development Contributions Practice Notes (July 2005), this has been omitted from the Plan in error and will have to be added.

3.6 Criterion 6 – Appropriate community liaison

The council has conducted appropriate community liaison and publicity in preparing the contributions plan.

We require evidence that the plan has been exhibited and publicised in accordance with the statutory requirements and that submissions received during the exhibition period have been taken into account. The post-exhibition version of the plan should not differ so significantly from the exhibited version that it requires re-exhibition.

It is not necessary that the relevant information is included in the contributions plan itself.

16. When was the plan publicly exhibited?

20 December 2017 until 29 January 2018

17. In developing the contributions plan, was any publicity and community liaison undertaken outside the mandatory exhibition period?

Community liaising and publicity were undertaken from 2008 with the community and community representatives (inc Aboriginal representatives, land owners). This occurred from the rezoning stage of Menangle Park leading to the preparation of LEP, DCP and the Contributions Plan. Community liaising and publicity was undertaken in the form of letters, meetings, Council reports.

Council publically exhibited the draft Plan from 20 December 2017 to 29 January 2018. The Plan's exhibition was in the local papers, at the local library and on Council's web site.

18. How has the council taken into account submissions received on the draft plan placed on exhibition?

Council received no submissions during the public exhibition period. However, Council did accept a request for a late submission. The majority of the comments within the late submission had already been dealt with in Council report 12 December 2017 (removal of Employment Land, Spring Farm Parkway, half road provision from the plan), an increase in the community facility was requested this is to be reviewed in the future, the other comments will be dealt with as part of the IPART assessment.

19. Does the council intend to undertake any further publicity or community liaison?

The results of the IPART assessment will be reported back to Council but no further publicity/community liaising is anticipated at this stage, no significant matters were raised within the submission so no further public exhibition or consultation is required.



3.7 Criterion 7 – The plan complies with other matters IPART considers relevant

IPART may take into consideration other matters relevant to our overall assessment of the contributions plan.

These matters may include compliance with the statutory requirements for making local infrastructure contribution plans and with the Practice Note, whether the plan uses up-to-date information, as well as issues of transparency and accountability in the council's proposed arrangements for the levying and collection of contributions under the plan.

20. Is there any other information relating to the contributions plan (such as use of VPAs) which may assist us to assess it against this criterion?

Council has an agreement with the new owners of the previously owned Council land to dedicate the open space to Council for a nominal fee of \$1.

21. Is the council aware of possible changes to any underlying assumptions used in preparing the plan which may be relevant to our assessment?

Such matters could include:

- revised population projections
- potential rezoning or changes to dwelling yields
- other changes to the applicable LEP, SEPP or DCP
- changes to NSW government policy for infrastructure delivery

No

22. Provide any other information which you consider would assist or expedite our assessment.

All appendices associated with this Plan have been included in the package.

4 Quality assurance

We also request that council undertake a quality assurance (QA) check of the contributions plan before it is submitted to IPART for review.

The purpose of the council's QA check is to identify and address any errors or inconsistencies within the work schedules and also between the contributions plan and relevant supporting information to ensure that the plan, as submitted, is accurate. This should reduce the risk that our assessment is delayed by the need for corrections to be made, or our report unnecessarily include recommendations to correct what are, in essence, calculation errors.

Checklist for the contributions plan

Has the contributions plan been checked for ...		
Typographical errors	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Calculation errors (including checking infrastructure and land cost calculations)	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Use of the most up-to-date- data and information	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>

23 Explain the quality assurance process undertaken for the contributions plan prior to submitting it to IPART for review.

The Plan has been reviewed to amend any typographical errors in the Plan. Land and facility values in the Plan have been checked against source documents.

5 Attachment checklist

Please complete the checklist below to ensure that all information necessary for IPART's assessment is submitted.

Councils should complete and attach Application Form Part B,¹ or provide IPART with spreadsheets (.xls files) that:

- ▼ detail all infrastructure items included in the plan, with references to the studies that support their inclusion in the plan as relevant
- ▼ detail the cost of each infrastructure item (including source and date of costings, and any indexation of cost estimates)
- ▼ list all parcels of land required for infrastructure in the plan
- ▼ detail the cost of any land that has already been acquired and land that the council is yet to acquire
- ▼ show how the total cost of land and works for each infrastructure category (or subcategory) have been apportioned
- ▼ show how the contributions rates in the plan have been calculated (including net present value modelling if this approach is used), and
- ▼ show indicative contribution amounts for each type of residential dwelling.

Checklist for council application

Application attachment

Work schedules and calculation of contribution rates

Application form Part B or	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
spreadsheets that provide the information listed above	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>

Contributions plan

Version of contributions plan incorporating any post exhibition changes	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	
Version of contributions plan publicly exhibited	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	
Version of contributions plan previously submitted to IPART for review	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Public consultation

Copy of all submissions to publicly exhibited contributions plan	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>
Summary of submissions and council's response	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>

Technical studies and consultant documents

Land valuation report/s	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>
Supporting studies for stormwater management infrastructure (eg, Flooding and Water Cycle Management report)	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>

¹ Application Form Part B is available on IPART's website.

Application attachment			
Supporting studies for transport infrastructure (eg, Traffic and Transport Assessment report)	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>
Supporting studies for open space infrastructure (eg, Demographic and Social Infrastructure report)	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>
Supporting studies for community services (eg, Demographic and Social Infrastructure report)	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>
Maps			
Plan catchment map/s -	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>
Final Indicative Layout Plan	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>
Zoning map/s	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>
Land acquisition map/s	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>
Constrained land maps/s	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>
Other documents			
VPAs	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Details of other funding agreements for state or local infrastructure in the area covered by the plan (including draft agreements)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>
Council business papers or meeting minutes related to the preparation of the contributions plan	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>
Any other documents that you think could be useful in IPART's assessment of the contributions plan	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>